



Continuation of rejections discussed: Discussed some minor claim informality issues and/or minor issues with respect to 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. NOTE: in claim 1, changed later occurrences re "processing device" language to "processing apparatus" so as to avoid confusion (particularly re claim 8) re which "processing device" is referred to, i.e., the overall "processing device" modules that include the platform, conveyance means, fluid guide etc., or the tooling portion that is located within such a module, i.e., processing device selected from the scribing device, venting device, etc. Also discussed potential art rejection over JP 2002-308422. .